

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

CHARLES H. HILL,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DR. ARANAS, et al.,

Defendants.

3:11-cv-00678-LRH-WGC

**ORDER**

Plaintiff, who is a prisoner in the custody of the Nevada Department of Corrections, has submitted a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (ECF No. 6) which the court screened pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiff has since then filed numerous motions including a motion for reconsideration, a motion for counsel, a motion to extend copywork and a motion for service by the U.S. Marshal. ECF Nos. 14, 15, 16, 17 and 22. For the reasons discussed below, the motions shall be denied.

A court may relieve a party from judgment for the following reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence; (3) fraud or other misconduct; (4) a void judgment; (5) a satisfied or discharged judgment; or (6) any other reason justifying relief from operation of the judgment. *See* Fed.R.Civ.P. 60(b); *Backlund v. Barnhardt*, 778 F.2d 1386, 1388 (9th Cir. 1985). Plaintiff's motion presents none of these. Rather, he objects to the Court's classification of his claim as arising under the Eighth Amendment's prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment, contends that, because the Court is not a physician or pharmacist, it is ignorant of

1 his claims, and suggests that the lack of a response by the defendants turns the screening Court's order  
2 into advocacy on their behalf.

3 As previously noted, plaintiff complains that he has been forced to take medications which he  
4 believes has caused or might cause serious side-effects. Based on the facts provided and the information  
5 submitted in support of the claims, the Court concluded that plaintiff did not show deliberate  
6 indifference to his health on the part of the defendants. This "lecture" by plaintiff in the form of a  
7 motion to reconsider does not persuade the Court that there are good grounds to reconsider. The motion  
8 is denied.

9 Because the action has been dismissed with prejudice and the motion to reconsider denied, the  
10 remaining motions - reiterations of others previously filed- remain moot.

11 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) Motion (ECF No. 14) is  
12 **DENIED.**

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that all other pending motions (ECF No. 15, 16, 17 and 22) are  
14 all **DENIED AS MOOT.**

15 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall not accept any other documents for filing in  
16 this action save a properly submitted Notice of Appeal.

17 DATED: this 27th day of December, 2011.



20  
21 **LARRY R. HICKS**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**